Case 2:02-cv-03830-LDD Document 334-7 Filed 05/23/2008 Page 1 of 26

Exhibit "F"

Case 2:02-cv-03830-LDD Document 334-7 Filed 05/23/2008 Page 2 of 26

ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

AGERE SYSTEMS, INC., CIVIL ACTION CYTEC INDUSTRIES, INC., FORD MOTOR COMPANY, SPS TECHNOLOGIES LLC and TI GROUP AUTOMOTIVE SYSTEMS LLC

Plaintiffs

v

ADVANCED ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION, ET AL.

NO. Defendants 02-CV-3830 (LDD)

Oral deposition of W. LEIGH SHORT, Ph.D., P.E., taken at the law offices of Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP, 1735 Market Street 42nd Floor, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on Monday, December 18, 2006, at 9:41 a.m. before Jennifer Bermudez, a Registered Professional Reporter, and Notary Public, pursuant to notice.



James DeCrescenzo Reporting, LLC

INNOVATING LITIGATION
1880 JFK Blvd., 6th Floor • Philadelphia, PA 19103
www.jdreporting.com

215.751.0581 FAX

1	APPEARANCES:
2	BALLARD SPAHR ANDREWS & INGERSOLL, LLP
3	AMY M. TROJECKI, ESQUIRE
4	trojeckia@ballardspahr.com 1735 Market Street, 51st Floor
5	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 215-665-8500
6	Attorney for Plaintiffs
7	WOLFF & SAMSON, P.C. THOMAS W. SABINO, ESQUIRE
8	tsabino@wolffsamson.com The Offices at Crystal Lake One Boland Drive
9	West Orange, New Jersey 973-530-2044
10	Attorney For AETC
11	PHELAN, PETTIT & BIEDRZYCKI JEFFREY L. PETTIT, ESQUIRE
12	jpettit@pp-b.com RICHARD C. BIEDRZYCKI, ESQUIRE
13	Rbiedrzycki@pp-b.com 121 S. Broad Street, Suite 1600
14	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107 215-546-0500
15	Attorneys for Ashland, Inc.
16	CARELLA, BYRNE, BAIN, GILFILLAN, CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN
17	G. GLENNON TROUBLEFIELD, ESQUIRE gtroublefield@carellabyrne.com
18	5 Becker Farm Road
19	Roseland, New Jersey 07068-1739 973-994-1700
20	Attorney for Handy & Harman Tube Company
21	LAW OFFICE OF EDWARD FACKENTHAL
22	EDWARD FACKENTHAL, ESQUIRE edwardfackenthal@cs.com
23	One Montgomery Plaza, Suite 209 Norristown, Pennsylvania 19401
24	610-279-3370 Attorney for NRM Investment Co.

3

	IAH DELOGITION (JE W. DEIGH SHOKI, FIL.D., F.E.,	
1	APPEARANC	ES (CONTINUED):	
2	HINMAN, H	OWARD & KATTELL, LLP K. KESSLER, ESQUIRE	
3	rkessl	er@hhk.com orporate Park Drive	
4	Suite		
5	914-69		
6	A C C C L	eg ror ir madomodica	
7		EXAMINATION INDEX	
8	W. LEIGH	SHORT, Ph.D., P.E. I BY MS. TROJECKI	4
.9	CROSS	BY MR. TROUBLEFIELD	
10	CROSS	BY MR. FACKENTHAL	
11		EXHIBIT INDEX	
12			MARKED
13	SHORT 1 EXPI	ERT REPORT	7
14		AILS, AUGUST 21ST AND	7 2
15	AUG	UST 22ND, 2006	
16		AIL FROM GORDON IESON TO LEIGH SHORT	110
17		TEMBER 2, 2006	
18		DON JAMIESON SUMMARY AUGUST 2006 WORK	115
19		IVITIES BOARHEAD FARMS	
20	5 DIA	GRAM, FIGURE 7	129
21	6 DIA	GRAM, FIGURE 3-22	174
22		PAGE HANDWRITTEN UMENT	3 2 5
23	200		
24			
	l	<u> </u>	

_	
1	Q. And that was sent after
2	that initial phone call meeting?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And the lawyers determined
5	that they were going to send you
6	those deposition transcripts and the
7	expert reports. Is that correct?
8	A. I believe that's correct.
9	Q. Were each you, Gordon, and
10	Jim is that it?
11	A. Jim.
12	Q to read each of the
13	deposition transcripts and each of
14	the expert reports and all of the
15	documents on the website, or was
16	there some division of responsibility
17	after that initial phone call
18	meeting?
19	A. We all the documents
20	sent to us by the law firm were sent
21	to Gordon, I believe, and he gave
22	them to the rest of us. We all read
23	those documents, the ones that came
24	from the law firm.

The information on the website, I'm not sure that we ever discussed who would do what. We each looked at parts of it that was going to help us understand what went on at the site and understand what we felt as individuals at that point, Ashland's activities vis-a-vis that site might or might not have to do with it. For example, the RI and the feasibility study and the ROD I believe were reviewed by all of us. Others might have looked individually at particular documents that the rest of us did not. And after that initial Q. phone call meeting was there some division of work that was made between you, Jim, and Gordon? Gordon was to take the lead in looking at the analysis of the hydrogeology/geology groundwater

monitoring well issues at the site

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

such as they may be. 1 Jim was going to take the 2 lead in reviewing the testimony of in 3 particular Curley, but wherever 4 somebody said or alleged that Ashland 5 wastes were deposited and to prepare 6 a section on the chemistry of metals, 7 8 chemistry generally. I was to take the lead in 9 looking at the remedy as it was 10 selected, what impact, if any, 11 Ashland has or had on that remedy and 12 how the remedy itself was implemented 13 and the data that was going into and 14 out of the treatment facility, 15 groundwater treatment facility. 16 Now, after that initial 17 Q. phone call meeting -- I just want to 18 make sure this is clear: 19 What you just told me, that Gordon would be 20 responsible for the hydrogeology and 21 geology, Jim would be responsible for 22 reading Curley's deposition testimony 23 and other deposition testimony having 24

.

1	to do with where Ashland wastes may
2	have been deposited, and your
3	expertise with the remedy selection,
4	that was all decided after that
5	initial first meeting phone call?
6	A. Now, when I say
7	responsible, I do not mean that all
8	of us did not end up looking at the
9	report or reviewing it but that that
LO	was the general area of gathering
L1	data to help us write the report, is
L2	the way we divvied those work
L3	assignments up.
L 4	Q. And was that all after the
L5	initial phone call meeting?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And, again, the overall
18	task after the initial phone call
19	meeting was what?
20	A. It was, as I understand it,
21	to look at all the data for the site
22	and prepare our analysis of what
23	responsibility, role, if any, Ashland
24	had in placing wastes on the site,

and if they did place them what 1 impact that would have on the remedy, 2 selection, and allocation of costs 3 and general costs. 4 5 MS. TROJECKI: Can you read that back? 6 7 (The court reporter read 8 back the following: 9 "A. It was, as I understand it, to look at all 10 data for the site and prepare our 11 analysis of what responsibility, 12 role, if any, Ashland had in placing 13 wastes on the site, and if they did 14 place them what impact that would 15 have on the remedy, selection, and 16 17 allocation of costs and general 18 costs.") BY MS. TROJECKI: 19 What was the next step in 20 21 the process, I quess, of creating this expert report that we marked as 22 23 Exhibit 1? 24 So just to let me

1	
1	backtrack.
2	Gordon contacted you and
3	Jim to tell you that Ashland had
4	retained you, then you had an initial
5	phone call meeting where documents
6	were sent and documents were sent
7	to you, and you had some division of
8	responsibility.
9	What was next after that?
10	A. Well, I think the answer to
11	your question is in part in one of
12	the e-mails, which I expect you have,
13	which I think starts off with one
14	from Gordon that says, Here we go, we
15	have been hired, or something to that
16	effect.
17	And we, as I recall it, put
18	together what I would call a bullet
19	outline of the sorts of things that
20	we were going to do.
21	And if you look through the

And if you look through the report we were going to write a brief history section, which is at the front of it, we were going to look at

22

23

24

Г	
1	forgotten the name of that particular
2	firm, but it came from
3	Q. Does demaximus ring a bell?
4	A. Pardon me?
5	Q. Demaximus.
6	A. It was probably demaximus.
7	Q. Do you recall requesting
8	any other documents?
9	A. Me personally, no.
10	Q. Now, of the items on your
11	bullet outline that we discussed
12	earlier, what were you specifically
13	supposed to do?
14	A. To look at the analysis of
15	the site data vis-a-vis what Ashland
16	might have put there to see if I
17	could identify any chemicals that
18	drove the remedy in some manner or
19	another or to identify places where
20	there are chemicals that they might
21	have put there and to review our
22	final report along with the other two
23	of us to see that it was consistent
24	with what we all thought.
	Į į

1	The review of the data that
2	I looked at does not suggest to me
3	that Ashland's chemicals, assuming
4	they were put there, in any way
5	drives the remedy.
6	Q. What parts of the report
7	did you physically write?
8	A. You want it line by line,
9	page by page, or topic by topic?
10	Q. However you did it. Well,
11	let's just go through it, then.
12	Describe to me how physically the
13	report was put together.
14	A. It was done in well,
15	obviously electronically, but the
16	original part on the hydrogeology was
17	written by Gordon, and if you read
18	this e-mail it also refers to the
19	fact he was away from August
20	something to September something, and
21	he prepared that at the very
22	beginning.
23	Jim and I discussed the
24	testimony as we understood it and the

various issues on the site, so he and
I between us wrote some of the
chemistry section, some of the
information where it refers to drums,
and some of the information on hot
spot areas.

- Q. So going back, just to make sure I'm clear, the part that Gordon wrote on the hydrogeology, which part of the report is that?
- A. Well, he wrote -- as I recall it, he wrote the history of the site.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And you will find words in here that say that he reviewed the groundwater flow modeling that was done by the site consulting firm, and he reviewed the information in the middle of Page 9, for example, where you have elevations and discussions on groundwater flow versus where Ashland allegedly put things versus flows in directions.

9.

1.7

r	
1	Q. So we know that Jamieson
2	wrote the history. Did he also
3	write, then, all of Opinion 3?
4	A. What page are you on now,
5	I'm sorry?
6	Q. Page 8. The bottom of Page
7	8.
8	A. I don't believe he wrote
9	all of that, no.
10	Q. Which paragraphs did he
11	write?
12	A. I don't other than the
13	actual data that comes in here on
14	groundwater flow, we don't write
15	reports that way. We typically have
16	a draft and then we all edit it and
17	write it.
18	Q. So how does the draft get
19	created?
20	A. It was pulled together in
21	the middle of September by basically
22	Jim and myself, because Gordon at
23	that time was in Europe.
24	Q. Now, in the initial draft

1	did Gordon write the site history?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And other than that, the
4	initial draft was written by you and
5	Jim. Is that correct?
6	A. Parts of it. Gordon had
7	prepared a lot of information that
8	you will find scattered through the
9	rest of it on groundwater and
10	groundwater flows and elevations.
11	Q. But physically who wrote
12	it?
13	A. Jim wrote most of it. I
14	rewrote and helped write parts of it.
15	Q. Did you write any part of
16	the first draft?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Which part?
19	A. Some of the information on
20	management of landfill sites and some
21	of the information that is the
22	summary of Opinion 3 which says that
23	we don't believe that that has any
24	effect on the remedy.

1	Q. And where in the report
2	does it speak about the management of
3	landfill sites?
4	A. In the middle top of
5	Page 8 there's some information there
6	about poor waste management practices
7	at the site.
8	Q. And you are referring to
9	the paragraph that starts, "Many acid
10	wastes were disposed about the site"?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And ends with, "Under
13	natural conditions most drums would
14	have lost their integrity." Did you
15	write that whole first paragraph?
16	A. I wrote a draft of it. I'm
17	not sure I wrote it in this final
18	form to get to the end of it.
19	Q. And in Opinion 3 which part
20	did you write the first draft of?
21	A. Back to where you get the
22	summary of it, on Page 10.
23	Q. Did you write any other
24	parts of Opinion 3 in the first

1	draft?
2	A. I edited them.
3	Q. But did you write any on
4	the first draft?
5	A. I don't think so.
6	Q. So other than that one
7	paragraph on Page 8 and the summary
8	of Opinion 3, did you write any first
9	drafts of any other paragraphs in
10	this report?
11	A. I wrote the Opinion 3B
12	section where it talks about hot spot
13	areas and VOCs.
14	Q. Anything else?
15	A. The material at the top of
16	Page 9 where again it identifies some
17	hot spots.
18	Q. Are you referring to the
19	paragraph that starts, "Three hot
20	spots"?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And where did you write
23	where is that in, the part that you
24	wrote?

		-			
1	Α.	Wha	t do y	you mean	where is
2	it?				
3	Q.	Ιŧ	start:	s with,	"Three hot
4	spots."	Did	you wi	rite jus	t the first
5	paragrap	h, or	did y	you write	e the first
6	two para	graph	s?		
7	A .	I w	as in	volved i	n the
8	writing	of al	1 of :	it, but	I put up a
9	draft of	the	first	paragra	ph, as I
10	recall i	t.			
11		And	to r	e-emphas	ize what I
12	said bef	fore,	what :	I was pa	rticularly
13	looking	for w	as to	make a	
14	professi	ional	judgm	ent as t	o whether
15	the chem	nicals	that	are dri	ving the
16	remedy v	were p	laced	on that	site by
17	Ashland,	, whic	h is	why I wa	s so
18	interest	ted in	what	are the	chemicals
19	of conce	ern th	at we	re liste	d and what
20	are the	drive	rs th	at are i	n the
21	groundwa	ater,	which	tend to	be things
22	like TC	Eand	DCA,	et ceter	a, which
23	were no	t thin	gs, t	o my und	erstanding,
24	that Asl	hland	put t	here.	

FAX 215.751.0581

the extent that metals are mobilized 1 under acid conditions. 2 Uh-huh. Α. 3 Can you tell me what if the 4 metals were not already in strong 5 acids; in other words, Opinion 1C 6 also applies to other metal treatment 7 wastes, so how does Opinion 1C affect 8 the other metal treatment wastes that 9 are not in acids? 10 If -- well, let me back up 11 Α. a little bit. 12 The sentence is saying that 13 the metals typically from pickling 14 waste come already in the acid. Ι£ 15 one were to encounter other metal 16 treatment wastes from whatever 17 source, they may or may not come in 18 19 an acidic stream. If they are disposed of 20 a place where there is not acid, 21 where it is not acidic, their 22 mobility or ability to mobilize would 23 be different than the ones that are 24

1	already i	n the a	acid.
2	Q.	Okay.	
3	A .	And to	o answer the other
4	metal tre	atment	wastes, it would
5	depend wh	ere the	e stream is, whether
6	it had a	eid in i	it, and where it went,
7	physical	y on th	he site, I mean.
8		But 10	C as written what
9	we are to	ying to	say is that because
10	Ashland	s wastes	s to our knowledge did
11	not have	metals,	, look elsewhere for
12	the sour	ces.	
13	Q.	Okay.	When you talk about
14	the high	ground	water flow rate,
15	what's t	ne basis	s for that statement
16	that the	ground	water flow rate is
17	high?		
18	Α.	At so	me point in the
19	document	s there	is a statement or
20	data tha	t sugge:	sts the groundwater
21	flow rat	e is so	mething like 500 feet
22	per year	, as I	recall it.
23		As gr	oundwater flow rates
24	go, that	's a fa	írly large number.
1			

1	That's what that means.	
2	Q. Do you recall what docume	nt
3	that was contained in?	
4	A. No, I do not. Nor do I	
5	recall if my memory is correct that	
6	that was 500.	
7	Q. I just want you to take a	
8	look at the groundwater model repor	t
9	for OU1 and just tell me if this is	
10	the document that you are speaking	of
11	that references a high groundwater	
12	flow rate.	
13	A. I believe the answer is	,
14	yes, and I would further tell you	
15	that this document is well within t	he
16	expertise of Gordon versus me.	
17	MR. BIEDRZYCKI: Can we	
18	just read the Bates number into the	
19	record?	
20	MS. TROJECKI: Sure. It	' S
21	PHKS 061239.	
22	MR. BIEDRZYCKI: Thank y	ou.
23	BY MS. TROJECKI:	
24	Q. Is this document the only	?

F	
1	basis for your statement that the
2	groundwater flow rate is high?
3	A. You would have to ask
4	Gordon that.
5	Q. Is the groundwater flow
6	rate high at all areas of the site?
7	A. My understanding is it is,
8	from briefly talking with Gordon
9	about it, if you will.
10	Q. On Page 4 of your report in
11	the second sentence of the paragraph
12	under the bullets you discuss "The
13	metals, acids and chlorinated organic
14	solvents found on the site are
15	consistent with those known to be
16	used in the metal plating and
17	finishing operations."
18	What chlorinated organic
19	solvents are you talking about?
20	A. Primarily TCE, which is
21	used as a degreasing chemical.
22	Q. Anything else?
23	A. That's the primary one.
24	Q. Did you do any analysis

1	into whether TCE was from any other
2	sources other than metal plating
3	operations?
4	A. Not directly, no.
5	Q. And what's the basis for
6	your statement that the TCE found on
7	the site is consistent with metal
8	plating and finishing operations?
9	A. TCE in the time frame of
10	the 1960s and '70s was very commonly
11	used as a degreasing chemical in
12	industrial facilities. And in my
13	experience there are not too many of
14	them that didn't use it as a
15	degreaser.
16	Q. Is that the only basis?
17	A. That's my basis, yes.
18	Q. And that's your only basis
19	for that statement?
20	A. Well, you can also, I
21	believe, look in the cited referenced
22	EPA reports and find that chlorinated
23	organic solvents are often found in
24	or with those discharges.

1	Q. Okay. Anything other than
2	the EPA reports and your
3	understanding that TCE was used as a
4	degreaser during the 1970s at plating
5	operations?
6	A. No. As I said, two things,
7	we weren't asked to go and do all the
8	checking of what individual people
9	might or might not have sent to
LO	this in my personal experience, I
L1	have probably worked on 20 to 30
L2	sites that used TCE as a degreaser, a
13	wide variety of manufacturing
L4	facilities.
15	Q. So not just metal plating
16	operations?
17	A. No. It's widely used, or
1.8	was widely used.
19	Q. On Page the bottom of
20	Page 4 of your report, Opinion 1D,
21	you make reference to a statement
22	from Vandeven's report, and I just
23	want to call your attention to the
24	last sentence on Page 4.
	1